

THIS PAPER is published weekly, by CYRIL C. CADY, at \$3 in advance, or \$4 at the end of the year. No paper will be discontinued but at the option of the Editor until all arrears are paid—and a failure to give notice of a wish to discontinue will be considered a new engagement.

#### Rates of Advertising.

One dollar per square, of twelve lines, or less, for the first insertion, and fifty cents a square for each subsequent insertion.

For one square 12 months twenty dollars. Merchants or others advertising by the year, to the amount of fifty dollars and upwards, will be entitled to a deduction of one third, where a regular agreement is entered into.

Where the insertion of an advertisement is ordered, without the number of insertions being specified, it will be inserted, (in the discretion of the proprietor) until forbid, and charged for accordingly.

All advertisements from strangers, as well as all orders for job-work, must be accompanied with the cash, or a reference to some responsible and convenient acquaintance.

From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade.

#### A PARODY—ON "UP SALT RIVER."

TUNE—"All on Hobbies."

Come Locos and Vans, and leg-treasurers too,  
Fanny Wright men and all we are waiting on you,  
Our vessel is ready, we cannot delay,  
For Harrison is coming and we must away.

Up salt river,  
Up salt river,  
Up salt river, salt river, hi O!

The journey is rough but never mind that,  
An experienced steersman is politic Mat,  
Full many a dark passage he's threaded before,  
And will land us all safe on that wide spreading shore.

Away up salt river, &c.

The first one that said'd was the Empire ship,  
Her rigging she man'd and her cables let slip,  
Cambreleng was there, with a thousand or so,  
Who will eat small potatoes with Marcy & Co.

Up salt river, &c.

The ship Michigan is also ahead,  
She took the same track where the Empire led,  
She too has her cargo, full many a score,  
Of wild cat bankers, to land on the shore.

Up salt river, &c.

The good ship Connecticut steady and true,  
As if winged like a bird o'er the wild waters flew,  
Well loaded with Vans who had laid in a store  
Of large Weathersfield Onions to plant on that shore.

Away up salt river, &c.

The Old Pennsylvanian, provisioned and man'd,  
Quite ready for sailing soon learn the land,  
Of change and experiments now very sick,  
She will carry the Vans where they tried to row Nick.

Up salt river, &c.

Next old Massachusetts her crew far from raw,  
No longer made drunk by her fifteen gallon law,  
Now sober'd and steady will start to explore,  
With her cargo of Vans, that late colonized shore.

Up salt river, &c.

The New Jersey next will be loudly cheer'd on,  
By Maxwell, Ayerling, Halsted, York & Stratton,  
Whist Dickinson, Cooper, Ryall and two more,  
Will take without contest their seats on that shore.

Away up salt river, &c.

Missouri now rigged will next hoist her sail,  
Harrisians will give her a glorious gale,  
At the port which she rents for she proudly will call,  
Leaving Tumble Bug Benton, a rolling his Ball.

On the shore of salt river, &c.

The noble Ohio is ready likewise,  
The pride and the glory of all the buckeyes,  
She's freighted with locos, the Shannons and more,  
And quasi Medary to land on the shore.

Away up salt river, &c.

And as we sail on we'll be still looking back,  
For the ships we expect on the very same track,  
For Virginia, Kentucky, and some half dozen or more,  
Are bound for the port on that fine filling shore.

Away up salt river, &c.

When they're all under way, we will knock off a toast,  
To old Tippecanoe, our pride and our boast,  
He'll be President next for changes then look,  
As our croot is transported from old Kinderhook.

Up salt river, &c.

BLEVITT.

#### MR. POINSETT'S 200,000 U. STATES MILITIA FORCE.

We publish to-day the notable scheme of the Secretary of War, as detailed by himself to Congress. We propose to analyze it more fully than we have yet done, and show it to be a most daring, dangerous and unconstitutional project. No man of discernment can examine it without feeling it to be the duty of a patriot to sound the alarm and arouse the people. We repeat this now, because we see the monster beginning to stir in the Senate.

"It is proposed to divide the United States into eight military districts, and to organize the militia in each district, so as to have a body of twelve thousand five hundred men in active service, and another of equal number as a reserve. This would give an armed militia force of TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND MEN, so drilled and stationed as to be ready to take their places in the ranks in defence of the country, whether called upon to oppose the enemy or repel the invader."—Annual Report of the Secretary of War.

"The present condition of the defence of our principal seaports and navy yards, as represented by the accompanying report of the Secretary of War, calls for the early and serious attention of Congress; and as connecting itself intimately with this subject, I cannot recommend too strongly to your attention the plan submitted by that officer for the organization of the militia of the United States."—Mr. Van Buren's last Annual Message.

The above two paragraphs contain the gist of the proposition, and its strong recommendation by the President.

From the details of the plan we gather the following recommendations:

1st sec. Every free able bodied white male citizen of the several States between the age of 20 and 45 shall be enrolled in the militia of the United States, and within three months after, shall arm himself at his own expense.

2d sec. All office holders in any way connected with the Federal Government shall be exempt.

3d sec. Citizens thus enrolled to constitute the first class, to be denominated the Mass, and to be organized.

4th. Each regiment shall furnish two companies of light infantry or riflemen—each division one company of artillery and one of horse, who shall be clothed and equipped at their own expense. The officers to have a cut and thrust sword. Officers of cavalry and dragoons to furnish themselves with horses, saddles, breast plates, boots and spurs, pistols, sabre, crupper, &c. &c.

5th. Proposes colors and martial music.

6th. A record of the men to be kept in the Adjutants General's office of each State, &c.

# BOON'S SLICK TIMES.

"ERROR CEASES TO BE DANGEROUS, WHEN REASON IS LEFT FREE TO COMBAT IT"—JEFFERSON.

BY CYRIL C. CADY.

FAYETTE, MISSOURI, SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1840.

Vol. I—No. 12.

7th. An Adjutant General shall be appointed in each State, with colonels rank, to distribute orders, attend reviews, perfect the discipline, explain the principles of returns, reports, and to report to head quarters, &c., and finally to make returns to the Secretary of War, who shall give the proper directions as to how they should be done.

8th. Defines the duty of Brigade Inspectors.

9th. Appoints a Quartermaster General in each State.

10th. Within months after the adoption of the plan, 100,000 men to be drafted for active service, to be denominated the active or movable force.

11th. Said force shall be organized and held to service for four years; one-fourth going out annually.

12th. There shall be a third class denominated the reserve or sedentary force—to be composed of those who have gone through the active probation—to continue thus subject 4 years, and then be subject to no further military duty, unless in case of invasion or a levee en masse.

13th. The deficit occasioned by the discharge to be made up by draft on the mass.

14th. The "territory of the United States" shall be divided into ten districts.

15th. Order of precedence shall be as follows: 1. Troops of the United States. 2. Militia of the U. States in this order, viz: 1. The active force. 2. The sedentary force. 3. The mass.

16th. Officers of the militia to be appointed as the State Legislature shall direct.

17th. The President of the United States may call out the 100,000 men twice a year, and while out and including the time when going to and returning from the place of rendezvous, they shall be deemed in the service of the United States, and be subject to such regulations as the President may think proper to adopt for their instruction, discipline, and improvement in military knowledge.

18th. In case of invasion or insurrection the President may call forth such numbers as he may judge sufficient.

19th. When the U. S. laws shall be opposed, or their execution obstructed, the President may call forth sufficient of this militia to cause the laws to be executed.

20th. The militia of the U. S., when in service shall be subject to the same rules and articles of war as the troops of the U. S.

21st. Every citizen enrolled in the militia shall be constantly provided with arms, &c.

22d. The U. S. militia, when called into service, shall be paid, like the infantry of the U. S.

23d. Officers of mounted companies to receive forage for horses.

24th. Those who lose a horse in service or battle to be paid for the same, not more than \$120.

25th. Militia to receive pay while travelling or being transported in the service of the U. S.

26th. The widows of those dying in service to receive half pay for 5 years.

27th. Courts martial to be composed of military officers only.

28th. If a citizen fail to march when ordered by the President, he shall be fined not less than half a month's pay, nor more than three months' pay, (not less than \$5 nor more than \$50,) which fine, contrary to the intention of the Constitution, is to be inflicted by a court martial, and all are liable to be imprisoned on failure to pay the fines imposed.

29th. The court martial is to certify the fines to the U. S. marshal, and he to collect them by the summary process of distress; and if the citizen have no property, he must suffer imprisonment "until the fine is paid."

30th. The Marshals to make a return of the levy of fines to the Adjutant General, and receive a commission of 5 per cent; and if they fail to make return, the Adjutant General is to inform the Solicitor of the Treasury of the U. S., who should instruct the U. S. Attorneys to proceed against said Marshals by attachment.

31st. Marshals to have the same force as sheriffs.

32d. Money collected for fines to be applied to the payment of militia expenses.

33d and 34. The President shall appoint an Adjutant General of the U. S. Militia, to be attached to the War Department, to receive \$3,000 per annum, and have two Clerks, with salaries at the discretion of the Secretary of War.

36th. The President to select depots of arms, &c.

Such are the principal subjects of the provisions contained in Mr. Poinsett's plan, and recommended by the President.

I am constitutionally inclined to proposing to place the Militia in certain contingencies under the orders and directions of the Federal Executive, thereby stripping the States of their authority to train the militia,—in putting the goods and chattels, and the personal liberties of free citizens under the control of U. S. Marshals,—and in usurping the power of imposing penalties on citizens of the States, and of enforcing them by courts martial.

Its tyranny consists in the confiscation and imprisonment of those conscript citizens, who should either refuse or be unable, by reason of poverty or otherwise, to comply with the requisitions of the Executive.

Its dangers lies in giving such a power to the President as would enable him to call forth a standing army, in fact, of 100,000 men, in the pay of the government, separated from the great body of the people, and required, possibly to vote or fight, as the Executive should desire, or be dragged from State to State, to suit political exigencies.

We can see no limit to the proportions of this monster, and have no guarantee in the character of our present rulers, or in those whom they might appoint to succeed them, that the proposed system would not overthrow the liberties of the country, and establish a military despotism upon their ruins.

The following notes will show by what authority we are supported in the estimate we have formed of this notable scheme.

The only authority conferred on the General Government by the Constitution in relation to the militia is contained in the following sentences:

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such parts of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively the appointment of the officers, and the authority

of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."—(Con. Sec. 8.)

When that provision was before the Convention which formed the Constitution, Mr. Sherman moved to strike out the last member, "and authority of training," &c.

Mr. King, by way of explanation, said that by organizing, the committee meant, proportioning the officers and men, by arming, specifying the kind, size, and calibre of arms, and by disciplining, prescribing the manual exercise, evolutions, &c.

Mr. Sherman withdrew his motion.

Mr. Gerry said he had as lief let the citizens of Massachusetts be disarmed, as to take the command from the States, and subject them to the General Government. It would be rejected as a system of despotism.

Mr. Madison observed, that "arming" as explained, did not extend to furnishing arms; nor the term "disciplining" to penalties and courts martial for enforcing them.

Dickinson, Gerry, Sherman, and other Republicans expressed great jealousy of the power of the General Government, and warmly urged the importance of leaving the militia almost wholly to the States. Mr. Dickinson declared that the States never would, nor ought to, give up all authority over the militia.—Mr. Sherman said that if the militia officers were to be under the control of the General Government, men of discernment would sound the alarm to arouse the people.

(Madisonian.)

#### From the Tennessee "Spirit of '76."

#### SELLING WHITE MEN FOR DEBT.

Among the many charges put in circulation against General Harrison by the unscrupulous portion of the Van Buren organs and leaders, is that of having voted in the Legislature of Ohio to sell poor white men for debt. Well, if this charge be true, we for one, are perfectly willing for him to receive the reprobation which such a vote would justly merit. But before we proceed to judgment, let us examine the evidence. The accusation is based upon the following:

Extract from the Journal of the Senate, of Ohio, Tuesday, January 30, 1821.

The Senate met, pursuant to adjournment. The day, resolved itself into a committee of the whole, upon the bill from the House, entitled an act for the punishment of certain offences, therein named, and after some time spent therein, the Speaker, Allen Trimble, resumed the chair.

Mr. Fithian then moved to strike out the 15th section of said bill, as follows:

Be it further enacted, That when any person shall be imprisoned, either upon execution or otherwise, for the non-payment of a fine or costs or both, it shall be lawful for the sheriff of the county to sell out such persons as a servant,

to any person within this State, who will pay the whole amount due, for the shortest period of service, of which sale public notice shall be given at least ten days, and upon such sale being effected, the sheriff shall give the purchaser a certificate, which time the relation of such purchaser and prisoner shall be that of MASTER AND SERVANT, until the time of service expires, and for injuries done by either, remedy shall be had in the same manner, as is, or may be provided by law in the case of master and apprentice. But nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent persons from being discharged from imprisonment according to the provision of the 37th section of the act to which this is supplementary, if it shall be considered expedient to grant such a discharge. Provided, that the court in pronouncing upon any person, convicted under this act, or the act to which this is supplementary, may direct such persons to be detained in prison until the fine be paid, or the person or persons otherwise disposed of agreeably to the provisions of this act.

And the yeas and nays being required, those who voted in the affirmative were Messrs. Beasley, Brown, Fithian, Gass, Houston, Jennings, Lucas, Matthews, McLaughlin, McMillon, Newcomer, Robb, Russell, Scofield, Shelby, Spencer, Stone, Swearington, Thompson and Womoder—20.

And those who voted in the negative were, Messrs. Baldwin, Cole, Foot, Foster, Wm. H. HARRISON, McLean, Oswell, Pollock, Ruggles, Roberts, Wheeler and the Speaker—12.

Now mark how triumphantly this calumny is put down by Gen. Harrison himself, in a plain and frank statement of his course. In reply to the charge first made against him and his eleven co-mongers of the Senate of Ohio, in 1821, he addressed the following letter to the editor of the Cincinnati Advertiser:

Sir: In your paper of the 15th instant, I observed a most violent attack upon eleven other members of the late Senate and myself, for supposed vote given at the last session, for a passage of a law to "sell debtors in certain cases." If such had been our conduct, I acknowledge that we should not only deserve the censure which the writer has bestowed upon us, but the execration of every honest man in society. An act of that kind is not only opposed to the principles of justice and humanity, but would be a palpable violation of the Constitution of the State, which every legislator is sworn to support; and sanctioned by a House of Representatives and a Senate of the State, would induce a state of depravity, which would fill every patriotic bosom with the most alarming anticipations. But the fact is, that no such proposition was ever made in the Legislature, or even thought of. The act to which the writer alludes, has no more relation to the collection of "debts" than it has to the discovery of longitude. It was an act for the "punishment of offences" against the State, and that part of it which has so deeply wounded the feelings of your correspondent, and has been so much the subject of the first vote by the twelve Senators, under the impression that it was the most mild and humane mode of dealing with the offenders for whose cases it was intended. It was adopted by the House of Representatives as a part of the general system of the criminal law, which was then undergoing a complete revision and amendment; the necessity of this is evinced by the following facts: For several years past it has become apparent that the Penitentiary system was becoming more and more burdensome at every session; a large appropriation was called for to meet the excess of expenditures above the receipts of the establishment. In the commencement of the session of 1820, the deficit amounted to near 20,000 dollars.

This growing evil required the immediate interposition of some vigorous legislative measure. Two were recommended as being likely to produce the effect; first, placing the institution under better management; and secondly, lessening the number of convicts who were sentenced for short periods, and whose labor was found of course to be most productive. In pursuance of the latter principle, thefts to the amount of fifty dollars, or upwards, were subject to punishment in the Penitentiary, instead of ten dollars, which was the former minimum sum; this was easily done. But the great difficulty remained to determine what should be the punishment of those numerous larcenies below the sum of \$50. By some, whipping was proposed; by others, punishment by hard labor in the county jails; and by others, it was thought best to make them work on the highways. All these three appeared insupportable objections: fine and imprisonment were adopted by the House of Representatives as the only alternative; and as it is well known these vexatious pilferings were generally perpetrated by the more worthless vagabonds in society, it added was that when they could not pay the fines and costs which are always part of the sentence and punishment, their services should be sold out to any person who would pay their fines and costs for them. This was the clause that was passed, as I believe, by a unanimous vote of the House, and stricken out in the Senate, in opposition to the twelve who have been denounced. A little further trouble in examining the journals would have shown your correspondent that this was considered as a substitute for whipping, which was lost only by a single vote in the Senate, and in the House by a small majority, after being once passed.

I think, Mr. Editor, I have said enough to show that this calumny is a law could not have applied to "unfortunate debtors of sixty-four years," but to infamous offenders who depraved upon the property of their fellow citizens, and who by the Constitution of the State, as well as the principle of existing laws, were subject to involuntary servitude. I must confess I had no very sanguine expectations of a beneficial effect from this measure, as it would apply to convicts who had obtained the age of majority; but I had supposed that a woman, or a youth, who had been convicted of an offence, remained in jail for the payment of the fine and costs imposed, might with great advantage be transferred to the residence of some decent, virtuous private family, whose precept and example would gently lead them back to the paths of rectitude.

I would appeal to the candor of your correspondent to say, whether, if there was an individual confined under the circumstances I have mentioned, for whose fate he was interested, he would not gladly see him transferred from the filthy enclosure of a jail, and the still more filthy inhabitants, to the comfortable mansion of some virtuous citizen, whose admonitions would check his vicious propensities, and whose authority over him would be no more than is exercised over thousands of apprentices in our country, and whose bound servants which are tolerated in our, as well as in every other State in the Union! For from advocating the abominable principles attributed to me by your correspondent, I think imprisonment for debt, under any circumstances, but that where fraud is alleged, is at war with the best principles of our constitution, and ought to be abolished!

I am, sir, your humble servant,  
WM. H. HARRISON.  
North Bend, Dec. 21, 1821.

In 1836, the charge was revived, and while Gen. Harrison was in Virginia, the following correspondence took place:—

RICHMOND, Sept. 15, 1836.  
Dear Sir:—Your political opponents in the State of Maryland have, for some time, been actively urging against you a new charge, that of SELLING WHITE MEN, which probably had no inconsiderable effect in the recent elections in that State, and which is evidently much relied upon to influence the apportioning elections throughout the United States. I enclose you a miniature Republican, containing the charge in full, and I beg of you, as an act of justice to yourself and your friends, to enable me to refute a charge against the uniform reputation of your life, which I am well aware, has been replete with instances of distinguished private liberality and public sacrifice.

With the highest respect,  
I have the honor to be,  
Your fellow citizen,  
JOHN H. PLEASANTS.  
Gen. Wm. H. HARRISON.

RICHMOND, Sept. 15, 1836.  
Dear Sir:—I acknowledge the receipt of your favor of this date. I have before heard of the accusation to which it refers. On my way hither, I met yesterday with a young gentleman of Maryland, who informed me that a vote of mine in the Senate of Ohio had been published, in favor of a law to sell persons imprisoned under a judgment for debt for a term of years, if unable otherwise to discharge the execution. I did not, for a moment, hesitate to declare that I had never given any such vote; and that, if a vote of that description had been published and ascribed to me, it was an infamous forgery. Such an act would have been repugnant to my feelings, and in direct conflict with my opinions, public and private, through the whole course of my life. No such proposition was ever submitted to the Legislature of Ohio—none such would, for a moment, have been entertained—nor would any son of hers have dared to propose it.

So far from being willing to sell men for debts, which they are willing to discharge, I am, and ever have been, opposed to all imprisonment for debt. Fortunately, I have it in my power to show that such has been my established opinion, and that, in a public capacity, I avowed and acted upon it. Will those who have preferred the unfounded and malicious accusation refer to the journals of the Senate of the United States, 24 session, 19th Congress, page 325? It will there be seen that I was one of the Committee which reported a bill to abolish imprisonment for debt. When the bill was before the Senate, I advocated its adoption, and on its passage, voted in its favor. See Senate Journal, 1st session, 20th Congress, pages 101 and 102.

It is not a little remarkable, that if the effort I am accused of having made, to subject men to sale for the non-payment of their debts, had been successful, I might, from the state of my pecuniary circumstances at the time, have been the first victim. I repeat, the charge is a vile calumny. At no period of my life would I have consented to subject the poor and unfortunate to such a degradation; nor have I omitted to exert myself in their behalf against such an attempt to oppress them.

It is sought to support the charge by means of garbled extracts from the journals of the Senate of Ohio. The section of the bill which is employed for that purpose had no manner of reference to the relation of a creditor and debtor, and could not by possibility subject the debtor to the control of his creditor. None know better than the authors of the calumny that the alleged section is utterly at variance with the charge which it is attempted to found upon it; and that so far from a proposition to invest a creditor with power over the liberty of his debtor, it had respect only to the mode of disposing of public offenders, who had been found guilty by a jury of their fellow citizens of some crime against the laws of their State. That was exclusively the import and design of the section of the bill, upon the motion to strike out which, I voted in the negative. So you perceive that in place of voting to enlarge the power of creditors, the vote which I gave concerned alone the treatment of malefactors convicted of crimes against the public.

It would extend this letter to an inconvenient length to go fully into the reasons which led me at the time to an opinion in favor of the proposed treatment of this class of offenders who would have fallen victim to its operations, nor is such an exposure called for. The measure was by no means a novelty in other parts of the country. In the State of Delaware, there is an act now in force in similar words with the section of the bill before the Ohio Senate, which has been made of late the pretext of such insidious invective. Laws with somewhat similar provision may probably be found in many

other of the States. In practice the measure would have ameliorated the condition of those who were under condemnation. As the law stood, they were liable under the sentence to confinement in the common jail, where offenders of various degrees of profligacy—of different ages, sex and color, were crowded together. Under such circumstances, it is obvious that the bad must become worse, whilst reformation could hardly be expected in respect to any. The youthful offender, it might be hoped, would be reclaimed under the operation of the proposed system, but there was great reason to fear his still greater corruption amid the contagion of a common receptacle of vice. Besides, the proposed amendment of the law presupposed that the delinquent was in confinement for the non-payment of a fine and costs of prosecution—(the payment of which was a part of the sentence;) it seemed, therefore, humane, in respect to the offender, to relieve him from confinement which deprived him from the means of discharging the penalty, and to place him in a situation in which he might work out his deliverance, even at a loss for a time of his personal liberty.

But I forbear to go farther into the reasons which led me, sixteen years ago, as a member of the Ohio Senate, to maintain a favorable opinion of an alteration which was proposed in the criminal police of the State. It is certain that neither in respect to myself, or those who concurred with me, was the opinion at the time considered as the result of unfriendly bias towards the poor or unfortunate. Nay, the last objection which could have been anticipated, even from the eager and reckless, to assail me, was a charge of unfriendliness to the humble and poor of the community.

I am, my dear sir, with great respect,  
Your humble servant,  
WM. H. HARRISON.  
J. H. PLEASANTS, Esq.

We might safely rest the case here, inasmuch as the provision for which General Harrison voted had reference alone to infamous offenders—those persons whose criminal conduct would have subjected them to imprisonment in the Penitentiary. The question was whether offenders of that description should be sent to the penitentiary, or whipped at the public whipping-post, or be suffered to lie and rot in the county jail, or be sold or hired out to some honest farmer or mechanic and be made to work out the fine and costs which they had incurred by their crimes against society. The experiment of sending them to the penitentiary had been tried, and was running the state in debt without any corresponding benefit to the offender. Besides, is it any worse to set a white man upon the public square and sell him for one or more years on a farm or in a workshop, than it is to shave his head, clothe him in a felon's dress, and put him to hard work within the walls of a penitentiary? We put it to the common sense of all men without respect to party—which is the worst! Would not ninety-nine out of a hundred prefer the mode of punishment voted for by General Harrison?

Again, if the reader will look back a page or two to the names of those who voted with General Harrison on this occasion, he will see first on the list that of ELI BALDWIN. And who is Eli Baldwin? Why, he is the same individual who was the Van Buren candidate for Governor of Ohio in 1836! Now, is it not too bad, that the Van Buren leaders and organs in Tennessee, in 1840, should call upon their followers and readers to go against General Harrison because he once voted along with Eli Baldwin, whom the organs and leaders of the same party pressed upon the people of Ohio in 1836 as a most suitable candidate for Governor? If General Harrison is unworthy of the support of the people of Tennessee in consequence of that vote, was not Eli Baldwin equally unworthy of the support of the people of Ohio?

Another of those who voted with General Harrison on the occasion referred to, is Nathaniel McLean, who was afterwards elected Keeper of the Penitentiary, and was subsequently the Jackson candidate for Congress from his district! Allen Trimble, who gave the same vote, was afterwards elected Governor!! In 1836, when General Harrison was run for President, and Eli Baldwin for Governor of Ohio, every man in the state who voted at all, must have voted for one or the other of these gentlemen—the Whigs for General Harrison and the Van Buren men for Eli Baldwin. And yet, after the whole state of Ohio, including both parties, have by their votes demonstrated to the world that they did not regard this vote of General Harrison and Eli Baldwin as rendering either of them in the slightest degree less worthy of public confidence—after Ohio has done this, we say, the organs and leaders of the party in Tennessee deem their fellow citizens ignorant enough to be made believe that there was something exceedingly wrong in it.

But further, it so happens that a similar law was once in force in this State and North Carolina by referring to Scott's edition of the Laws of Tennessee, vol. I, page 383, the reader will find the following:

An Act for hiring out persons convicted on indictment or presentment, not being able or willing to pay the fees of office and gaoler's fees. Whereas, any persons convicted on indictment, take the benefit of the insolvent act, either neglecting or refusing to pay fees of office, and sheriff's and gaoler's fees, to the great injury of the citizens of this state; for remedy whereof,

1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That all and every person who shall be found guilty of any charge exhibited against him or them by indictment or presentment, and shall be unable or unwilling to pay the office and gaoler's fees, that are or may be consequent thereon, shall be hired out by the sheriff of the county where such person is or may be convicted, for such time as any person will take him or them to serve for the said fees and charges, the said sheriff first advertising the time and place of hiring at least ten days previous thereto.

Here is precisely the same law, in principle! It was actually in force in Tennessee until 1811, when it was repealed by implication by the insolvent law of that year. Yet whoever heard its authors denounced in Tennessee and the parent state?

But we have not yet done with our exposure of the insincerity and hypocrisy of the Van Buren organs and leaders in Tennessee, who are urging the objection in question to General Harrison. One of their most "shining lights" is the Hon. FELIX GRUNDY—a gentleman of whom they are so fond, that they actually elected him twice to the Senate of the United States last winter. He was a member of the legislature of Tennessee in 1824, and on the 79th page of the Journal of the House of Representatives for that year, we find the following entries:

A Bill to restrain idle and disorderly persons from running at large, was taken up on its third and last reading in both houses.

Mr. Grundy and Mr. Crockett proposed amendments to said bill, which were adopted.

Mr. Young moved to strike out that part of said bill which provides that any person pursuing gambling for livelihood, pretending to feats of balancing on slack wire, rope-dancing, ventriloquism, or any other exhibition of the like kind, who should be unable or unwilling after the term of ten days imprisonment, under the provisions of this bill, to pay the fine and costs by this act prescribed, shall be sold by the sheriff, to the lowest bidder, for the fine and costs.

On this motion, the yeas and nays were required. There were yeas 31, nays 0.

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs. Speaker, Allen, Hale, Barnes, Reedy, Carriger, Cleveland, Cowan of B., Cowan of L., Clentham, Clack, Crisp, Crockett, Holt, Jones, Kelly, Lytle, McCallan, Maury, Nelson, Pierce, Folk, Sharpe, Stephens, Walton, Watkins, White, Whitson, Williams, Watterston, and Young—31.

Those who voted in the negative are, Messrs. Douglass, Paine, GRUNDY, Hogan, Renau, and Scanland—0.

If Gen. Harrison's vote be exceptionable, how much more so is that of Mr. Grundy, who voted to sell white men, not for crimes, nor for debt, but for the innocent exercise of the